

REMARKS

This is a response to a Non-Final Office Action mailed on March 27, 2007. Claims 1-6 were pending. Claims 1 and 4 are amended. Claims 7 and 8 are new. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis US 20050198042A1- Division of application No. 09/573,413 filed May 18, 2000 (hereinafter Davis), in view of Chen et al. US006507856B1 filed January 5, 1999 (hereinafter Chen). However, the amended claims distinguish over and are patentable over the cited art.

Davis is directed to providing a chart view for a Reusable Data Markup Language (RDML). Davis Abstract. The RDML facilitates the browsing and manipulation of numbers, as opposed to text as in HTML. *Id.* Davis discloses displaying the chart view above, but not overlaid partially on top of, a tree view in the same rendered RDML document. See e.g., Fig 14A. Chen is directed to XML processing. Chen Abstract; Fig. 1.

Davis in view of Chen does not teach or suggest “modifying the DOM of the web page by inserting the graphic object within a hierarchy of the DOM *so that the graphic object is displayed overlaid partially on top of and in close proximity to the element* when the DOM is rendered by an HTML rendering engine,” as recited by amended Claim 1. This aspect of the invention is disclosed in the Specification. See e.g., Specification, p. 3, lines 27-28; Fig. 1B (showing graphs floating partially on top of web page elements). In contrast to amended Claim 1, Davis discloses displaying the chart view above a tree view in the layout of the same rendered RDML document. Nothing in Davis teaches or suggests that the chart view *is displayed overlaid partially on top of and in close proximity to* a rendered RDML element to which it is associated. Also, Chen, alone or in combination with Davis, does not teach or suggest this element.

Moreover, Davis in view of Chen does not teach or suggest “constructing a graphic object that conveys user interaction information *about a prior use of the element* based on

statistics available for the element,” as recited by amended Claim 1. This aspect of the invention is disclosed in the Specification. See e.g., Specification, p. 3, lines 7-9; 22-28. In contrast to amended Claim 1, Davis’s chart view displays information conveyed by and included in an RDML element itself, and not information *about a prior use of the element*. See Davis Abstract (“Upon receiving RDML markup documents, the chart view transforms, formats, manipulates and displays data stored in the [RDML] markup documents using the attributes describing the meaning of the data”). Additionally, Chen, alone or in combination with Davis, does not teach or suggest this element either.

Lastly, nothing in Davis or Chen teaches or suggests “modifying the DOM of the web page by inserting the graphic object within a hierarchy of the DOM ...” as recited by amended Claim 1. This aspect of the invention is disclosed in the Specification. See e.g., Specification, p. 3, line 31 - p. 4, line 3; Figs. 3-4. At least for these reasons, Davis in view of Chen does not make amended Claim 1 obvious. Thus, amended Claim 1 should be in condition for allowance.

Amended Claim 4 recites similar, albeit different elements as amended Claim 1. At least for substantially similar reasons as for amended Claim 1, amended Claim 4 should also be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend from amended Claims 1 and 4 respectively. Thus, these dependent claims should be allowed at least for substantially similar reasons as for their independent claims.

### **New Claims**

Claims 7 and 8 are new. These claims are taught in the Specification. See e.g., Specification, p. 2, lines 12-14; p. 3, lines 7-9; lines 22-23; Figs 1A-1B. The cited references do not teach or suggest these claims. Thus, new Claims 7 and 8 should be in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (925) 944-3320.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles E. Krueger/

Charles E. Krueger

Reg. No. 30,077

LAW OFFICE OF CHARLES E. KRUEGER  
P.O.Box 5607  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Tel: (925) 944-3320 / Fax: (925) 944-3363